



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,401	03/13/2007	Dan Chen	026613-9004-US	2084
23409	7590	08/12/2010	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP			HAILE, AWET A	
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE				
Suite 3300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			2474	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of 11, the request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding amended independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 16, the applicant argued that, “...

I) the feature "the resource states of the paths from the edge router to all the **other edge** routers in the **same domain are recorded in said QoS resource list**" is not disclosed in Li..."

Remarks page 7 last paragraph.

II) There is no evidence in Li showing that if there are N edge routers in the domain, the resource states of the paths from the edge router to the other N-1 edge routers are recorded in the resource list of each router..." Remarks page 8 paragraph 2.

III) the edge router IDs of each passed QoS domain stored in the edge router list of Li could not provide the resource information of all possibilities of paths in the same domain, thereby resulting in an inaccuracy when establishing reservation paths for aggregate flow between the edges, Page 8 last paragraph.

In response to applicant's argument, examiner respectfully disagrees with the arguments above.

I) Li teaches, the resource states of the paths from the edge router to all the other edge routers in the same domain are recorded in said QoS resource list (see paragraphs 172-177 and Figs. 4-5, i.e., each of the edge routers forming a quality of service edge router list, related to resources between source APP1 and destination APP2 paths).

Furthermore, Li's QOS domain 1 includes Edge routers R1 and R2, and each of the edge routers R1 and R2 are added to a quality of service edge router list. QOS domain 2 includes Edge routers R3 and R4, and each of the edge routers R3 and R4 are added to the quality of service edge router list, thus it reads on applicant's argued limitation "the resource states of the paths from the edge router to all the other edge routers in the same domain are recorded in said QoS resource list", since, edge routers R1 and R2 are the only edge routers in a same domain and the resource list includes routing paths from R1 to R2 and from R2 to R1, edge routers R3 and R4 are the only edge routers in a same domain and the resource list includes routing paths from R3 to R4 and from R4 to R3.

II) In response to applicant's argument that the reference fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*if there are N edge routers in the domain, the resource states of the paths from the edge router to the other N-1 edge routers are recorded in the resource list of each router*"") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant does not specifically claimed (in claims 1, 6, 12 and

16)” *if there are N edge routers in the domain, the resource states of the paths from the edge router to the other N-1 edge routers are recorded in the resource list of each router*”.

III) In response to applicant’s argument that the reference fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “the resource information of all possibilities of paths in the same domain”, thereby resulting in an inaccuracy when establishing reservation paths for aggregate flow between the edges “) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant does not specifically claimed (in claims 1, 6, 12 and 16) “the resource information of all possibilities of paths in the same domain”, thereby resulting in an inaccuracy when establishing reservation paths for aggregate flow between the edges”.

Regarding dependent claims, 3-5, 8-11, 14, 15 and 18-21 the applicant argues these claims conditionally on that of their parent independent claims.

Applicant’s arguments are unpersuasive and, therefore, the rejections of these claims are hereby maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AWET HAILE whose telephone number is (571)270-3114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung S. Moe/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2474

/AWET HAILE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2474